V. We would also like to draw your attention that whereas the conditions in the tender specified that the tenderers (not their agents) should apply for the ISI marking, it appears that some organsiation by the name of MENEZES ELECTRONICS PVT. LTD. of R49 Duram, Panjim, Goa, had made an application and was annexed to the PEICO/PHILIPS quotation. This is completely contrary to the conditions of the tender which clearly specifies "Tenderer must have applied to the ISI.... .....proof of this should be enclosed with the tender....."

VI. It is evident that M/s. MENEZES ELECTRONICS of GOA, manufactures these hearing aids.

VII. A recent High Court ruling has decreed that PEICO is not permitted or authorised to use the trade name' 'PHILIPS' and on articles not made by PHILIPS as this amount to "passing off" However, during the reading of the tender, PEICO has quoted for PHILIPS Hearing aids, which amounts to "Passing-Off."

*Extension of* 1985-86 *Rate Contract till* 13-3-1987:

We have also been advised that vide your letter dated 28th March, '86 you have proposed to extend the rate contract for supply of hearing aids finalised for 1985-86 for one year and have requested the hearing aids manufactures to confirm, whether they would be willing to supply the hearing aids till 31.3.87 at the same rate. Our above members consider your aforesaid request unjustifiable after calling tenders afresh for the current year. They are of the view that your above action may be with an idea to exclude our such members who have quoted for the first time. It is regretted that you did not ponder over these specific facts of prime importance before proposing to keep the contractual prices for 1985-86 in tact till 31.3.87!

*Report on the action taken on the complaint.*

The complaint was examined. As in the past, tenders for hearing aids were invited for 1986-87 from all manufacturers and suppliers (who may not be manufacturers). There were no irregularities in the rseceipt and opening of the tenders. There was also no irregularity in extending the last year's contract.

**Allocation of Advertising time by Doordarshan**

1684. DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI: Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Doordarshan has allocated advertising time to several advertising agencies;

(b) if so, the names of these advertising agencies, the time allocated and the rates payable, agency-wise, during the year 1985-86 and till June, 1986; and

(c) whether these advertising agencies sell television time at an exorbitant price in the market?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI V. N. GADGIL): (a) So far as spot advertisements are concerned, no advertising time is allocated to agencies as such. The agencies are free to book their advertisements at a particular time of their choice provided the time is available. However, Doordarshan does allocate sponsorship of programmes to advertising agencies.

(b) A statement indicating allocation of sponsorship of Doordarshan programmes to advertising agencies during 1985 and 1986 (till June) is attached at Annexure-I. [*See* Appendix CXXXIX Annexure No. 98.] A copy of the rate card on the basis of which payments are made to Doordarsan by sponsors is attached at Annexure-II. [*See* Appendix CXXXIX, Annexure No. 99.]

(c) Government has no information whether the agencies sell allocated programmes at an exorbitant price.